

### **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for courtesies extended during the telephone interview on April 7, 2008, and for carefully considering the application.

#### **Interview Summary**

An interview was conducted on April 7, 2008. The Examiner completed an Interview Summary on April 11, 2008. Applicants have reviewed the Interview Summary and agree with its content.

Briefly, proposed claims 1 and 3 were discussed. Applicants asserted that, as amended, proposed claims 1 and 3 would overcome the prior art. An agreement was reached that proposed claim 3 is tentatively allowable.

#### **Disposition of the Claims**

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, and 20 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from the independent claims. Claims 21-22 have been added by this reply. Claims 3, 5, 12, 14, and 19 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer, by this reply. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4, 6-11, 13, 15-18, 20-22 are now pending.

#### **Claim Amendments**

Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 13, 15-18, and 20 have been amended by this reply for clarification in accordance with the agreement with the Examiner and to correct formality issues. No new matter is added by way of these amendments.

### **Amendments to the Specification**

The specification has been amended to correct obvious typographical errors. No new matter is added by way of these amendments.

### **Objections to the Specification**

Examiner objects to the specification due to an informality. The specification has been amended to correct the informality. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Objections**

Examiner objects to claim 11 for reciting “a resistor transfer level design.” Applicants apologize for this error and have amended the claim to correct the obvious typographical error by replacing “resistor” with “register.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Examiner rejects claims 1-18 and 20 as failing to comply with statutory subject matter because the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification. Applicants have amended the claims accordingly to clarify terms used in the claims, which are now described in the specification. To the extent the rejection applies to the amended claims, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Examiner rejects claims 1-20 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended the claims accordingly. To the extent the rejection applies to the amended claims, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 9-11, and 18-20 as being unpatentable over the reference entitled “Design Verification of Complex Microprocessors” (Yim), and in view of the reference entitled “Crafting a compiler with C” (Fischer). To the extent the rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner “must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference....” MPEP § 2143(A).

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, and 20 to include the limitations of claim 3. Applicants assert that Yim in view of Fischer fail to render amended claims 1, 10, and 20 obvious. Further, during the Examiner Interview held April 7, 2008, Examiner agreed that these claims amended to include the limitation of claim 3 appear to be allowable. Therefore, Applicants assert amended claims 1, 10, and 20 are patentable over Yim and Fischer, whether viewed separately or in

combination. Dependent claims 2, 9, 11, 18, and 19, which depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 10 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **New Claims**

Claims 21-22 have been added by this reply and depend from claim 20. For reasons stated above, amended claim 20 is allowable. Newly added claims 21 and 22, which depend from claim 20, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 33226/323001; P9378).

Dated: April 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/  
Robert P. Lord  
Registration No.: 46,479  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicants